



**PLEASANT GROVE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
JULY 18, 2024**

PRESENT: Chair Pro Tempore Alica Redding, Commissioners Dustin Phillips, Jeffrey Butler, Jim Martineau, Wendy Shirley, Kenna Nelson, Denise Trickler

STAFF: Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director; Jacob Hawkins, City Planner; Sean Cho, Staff Engineer; Christina Gregory, Planning & Zoning Assistant; Magali Acevedo, Administrative Assistant

EXCUSED: Chair Karla Patten; Commissioner Todd Fugal

REGULAR SESSION

In the absence of Chair Karla Patten, Chair Pro Tempore Alicia Redding called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commission Business:

1. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks: Commissioner Martineau led the Pledge of Allegiance. Commissioner Butler offered the opening remarks.

2. Agenda Approval.

- MOTION:** Commissioner Butler moved to APPROVE the agenda as written. Commissioner Martineau seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion carried.

3. Staff Reports:

- MOTION:** Commissioner Martineau moved to APPROVE the Staff Reports as written. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes". The motion carried.

4. Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members.

There were no declarations or abstentions.

1 **ITEM 1 – Public Hearing: General Plan Update–Chapter 4: Housing**
2 **(City Wide)**

3 Public Hearing to consider a request from Pleasant Grove City to amend Chapter 4 of the 2023
4 General Plan, to revise the benchmarks and strategies for moderate income housing. (Legislative
5 Item)
6

7 Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, presented the Staff Report and appreciated
8 the willingness of the Commissioners to be present on a different date. The above item seeks to
9 amend the strategies already adopted to address the City's moderate-income housing goals. In
10 2023, the City adopted five strategies to continue the work already started by the City to support
11 the availability of moderate-income housing in Pleasant Grove. The State listed a wide variety of
12 strategies that could be selected and labeled them A through Z [see Utah Subsection 10-9a-
13 403(2)(b)(iii)]. From that list, Pleasant Grove selected strategies A, E, F, H, and X. Page 70 of
14 the 2023 General Plan was displayed. The following information was provided regarding each
15 strategy chosen:
16

- 17 • Strategy A pertains to rezoning for densities. In this case, the City has added residential
18 units to five zones where they were not previously allowed.
- 19 • Strategy E states to create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, internal or
20 detached accessory dwelling units ("ADU"). Pleasant Grove is the second city in the State
21 to permit ADUs. The ordinance to allow for ADUs was passed in 2016. The hope was
22 that the State will recognize that progress.
- 23 • Strategy F pertains to zoning in mixed-use zones, which was identified by the State as
24 being too similar to Strategy A and was to be deleted.
- 25 • Strategy H pertains to reducing unneeded parking requirements in cases where residents
26 are less likely to rely on vehicles for transportation. This year, the size of parking stalls
27 has been reduced from 9' x 20' to 9' x 18' in the Downtown Village Zone, and last year,
28 the parking spaces for residential uses in the Boulevard Mixed Use Overlay was reduced
29 from 2 spaces per unit to 1.75 spaces per residential unit.
- 30 • Strategy X [previously known as Strategy W] pertains to reducing the number of
31 requirements pertaining to multi-family dwellings. For example, in the General Plan, the
32 Downtown Village Zone now allows for up to five stories for residential dwellings as long
33 as a certain percentage of retail use is included. Buffer zones were also added next to
34 single-family dwellings that allow a higher density of residential dwellings.
35

36 In place of Strategy F, a new Strategy J was proposed that pertains to implementing zoning
37 incentives for moderate-income units in new developments. An exhibit showing the benchmarks
38 were displayed and were identified as follows:
39

- 40 • In 2025, a committee will be created to identify areas in the City where new residential
41 development and residential re-development can occur. A list of incentives will be
42 proposed to create moderate-income units. Details will follow.
- 43 • In 2026, an ordinance addressing new regulations and incentives will be drafted and
44 amended.
- 45 • In 2027, developers will be provided with moderate-income housing incentives and
46 promote their use.

- In 2028, the results of using the incentives will be monitored to determine the impact or effect of the strategy.
- In 2029, they will evaluate the success of the strategy and modify the Code, if needed.

Each of the strategies includes benchmarks since the City is required by State law to report on them yearly. The Commission was asked to approve this approach as the correct way to proceed.

Chair Pro Tempore Redding opened the public hearing.

There were no public comments. The Chair Pro Tempore invited the Commissioners to either continue the discussion regarding the item or bring a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

MOTION: Commissioner Martineau moved that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the proposed amendments to the Moderate Income Housing Chapter of the General Plan to remove Strategy F and add Strategy J; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report and as modified by the conditions below:

1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Yes”. The motion carried.

ITEM 2 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment–Section 10-15-14: Flag Lots (City Wide)

Public Hearing to consider a request from Pleasant Grove City to amend City Code Section 10-15-14, Flag Lots. The city is proposing to make changes to the zoning requirements for the potential development of interior lots with the intent to facilitate the development of infill areas in an orderly and reasonable manner. (Legislative Item)

Director Cardenas presented the Staff Report and stated that currently, the Code allows flag lot subdivisions to be created with up to a maximum of five lots with three interior lots and two frontage lots. Two frontage lots are required for utility installation. Director Cardenas reported that there is a letter from the Engineering Department that details problems the City faces with the installation of flag lot subdivisions. Examples were provided to the Commission addressing issues with specific flag lot subdivisions including the following:

- Flag lots should have straight stems; however, that is not always the case which can create problems.
- The City’s Engineering Department discovered that some of the lots have complicated drainage and utility connection issues.
- The small area of flag lots can complicate setback requirements.
- Problems with drainage, access, and parking typically arise once the flag lots are developed and established.

- The stem is on private property, which means that any repairs are the responsibility of the homeowner. It was noted that the City cannot enforce parking requirement issues as the area is governed by the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs).

The old Code allowed these types of developments to be built. The new Code is being updated to resolve these types of issues. It also requires that a flag lot subdivision not be the first option for developers and will be allowed only when development constraints prevent a road from being built in accordance with the City's Vicinity Plan. The new rule also limits interior lots to one instead of three. That restriction makes it much easier to manage. It was noted that some cities do not allow flag lots and the cities that do allow them have stringent requirements. What is being proposed is restrictive, but the changes will resolve many of the current problems.

There was general discussion with the following being explored:

- In comparison to the other cities, the question was raised as to how restrictive the new plan is on a scale of 1-10. Director Cardenas stated that the new plan is right in the middle as it allows flag lots, but it no longer allows the type of flag lot subdivision that created problems in the past. Staff has found that if a developer is required to put a road in he will fight it since a flag lot is less expensive and does not require the infrastructure that a road would. The presence of a flag lot further reduces opportunities for traffic connectivity, and it often becomes necessary for other developments to also utilize flag lots.
- Referencing the City's Vicinity Plans for Undeveloped Properties: Map H-6, Director Cardenas stated that this provides the city with an idea on where roads should go. If the current three-interior lot requirement were approved in the area between 500 East and 600 East, and north of 300 North, the first flag lot development would preclude an adjacent owner from developing property unless there is another flag lot. This creates a domino effect that would require additional flag lots in the area since all would be required to provide access. He stated that there are currently no new applications for flag lots.
- Although the Vicinity Plan can be amended, its main purpose is to allow for walkability, connectivity, placement of water and sewer, and adequate drainage. The City wants all property owners to have the opportunity to develop their property. That works better when development takes place with adequate public rights-of-way. It is difficult to manage sewer and utility connectivity when a private right-of-way is involved.
- In response to a question raised, Director Cardenas stated staff is not trying to prevent flag lot development. This issue has been considered and worked on for at least one year. If an application was pending the rules in place at the time of application would apply. As for the person who is in the pre-application stage who asked about the possibility of a flag lot during a recent Development Review Committee ("DRC") Meeting, he was informed that a Vicinity Plan would need to be amended before the Planning Commission and presented to the City Council for approval.
- There are some areas where a road adjustment can be made but not in all areas. Several examples were shown on a Vicinity Plan where it is impossible to change the road location.
- Mr. Cardenas reiterated that flag lots have been problematic for City staff.
- Commissioner Shirley asked if the proposed amendment impacts the long, narrow lots that were discussed about one year ago. It was reported that the single lots were previously

1 approved for mother-in-law units and are not considered subdivisions. The proposed
2 change would not apply to them.

- 3 • Director Cardenas described an area near the border of Lindon and Pleasant Grove that has
4 a partially constructed road known as 1000 South. If flag lots are to be approved in that
5 area the road will never go through, the complexity of utilities and drainage in the area will
6 increase, and more problems will result in the future.
- 7 • There was discussion about the impact of the number of lots involved and the issues that
8 could impede development options for other property owners. It was noted that problems
9 arise when there are multiple lots with no frontage access.
- 10 • Commissioner Butler raised a question about the wording of Section G, Item 1 which
11 states, "A common stem and a common driveway shall be used to serve adjoining flag lots,
12 up to two flags." There was discussion and ultimately the conclusion was that the City's
13 intent is to have one flag off of one stem. It was acknowledged that the language is in draft
14 form and the wording continues to be amended.
- 15 • Commissioner Phillips asked about width as addressed in Section N. Director Cardenas
16 confirmed that an owner cannot use the stem driveway as frontage for the purpose of
17 setbacks. It was suggested that the matter be continued to allow the language to be
18 modified, undergo legal review, and return to the Commission for action.

19
20 **MOTION:** Commissioner Phillips moved to CONTINUE the hearing on the requested code text
21 amendment for flag lots to the August 8, 2024, meeting, with the understanding that the
22 Commission concurs on the direction of reducing the interior number of lots from three lots to one
23 and allowing Director Cardenas latitude to revise and finalize the language as appropriate.
24 Commissioner Martineau seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Yes".
25 The motion carried.

26
27 **MOTION:** Commissioner Butler moved to ADJOURN. The Commissioners unanimously voted
28 "Yes". The motion carried.

29
30 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:44 p.m.

31
32
33 
34 Planning Commission Chair

35
36
37 
38 Christina Gregory, Planning & Zoning Assistant

39
40 8-22-2024
41 Date Approved